

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 25 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102(e)

The present invention is a method for enabling a limited resource device such as a cellular phone, to download compatible user applications from the platform of a service provider.

Since limited resource devices are many and varied, not all user applications can be run on all limited resource devices.

The present invention discloses a method whereby a service provider's platform solves this problem by performing the following five functions:

1. Receive user applications from content providers.

2. Examine and test the user applications. The applications are examined and tested for compatibility with various limited resource devices, since limited resource devices are, as their name implies, limited. They may be limited, for example, in their memory capacity, display size or quality, color etc, ability to vibrate, sound capability and CPU speed. It is therefore necessary that the user application be examined and tested to determine whether it can be run satisfactorily on the limited resource devices.

3. Determine which user application is capable of being run on which limited resource device. The content provider can then provide an application and the system automatically publishes it in several versions (or flavors), each version suitable for a particular limited resource device.

4. Publishing a list (or menu) of user applications in such a way that each limited resource device can see only those applications that are suitable for downloading and running on that limited resource device.

5. Downloading the selected user application to the limited resource device.

The prior art discloses a method whereby a limited resource device may operate and interact with a user application that runs on a service provider's platform. The disadvantage of this method lies in the fact that in order to run the user application, the limited resource device must be in constant contact with the service provider's platform. This is costly in terms of airtime and bandwidth, and the response time of the application may be unnecessarily slowed down by connection issues or by availability issues at the hosting server. A further disadvantage is that the limited resource device will not be able to run the user application when it is not in contact with the original platform of the service provider, e.g. when the limited resource device is used abroad. If it is possible to make contact in such circumstances then the airtime may be particularly expensive.

The present invention solves these problems by publishing the applications in such a way as to enable the limited resource device to download the user application and run the user application independently, without the need to be in contact with the service provider. This entails examining the application for compatibility with particular devices and ensuring that a given device can download only those user applications with which it is compatible.

Claim 1 as currently amended clearly recites the examination of the application for compatibility with given devices and the downloading of the application specifically to those devices with which it is found to be compatible. These features are neither taught nor suggested by Rouse.

By contrast Rouse teaches a method for provisioning the usage of an application by a limited-resource device, while the application runs on the *service provider's platform*, downloading *data*, resulting from the *running* of the application elsewhere, to the limited-resource device. Rouse does not teach or even hint at downloading of the application to the limited resource device. The reason is presumably that since the applications are from external sources it is considered unfeasible to determine for each application exactly what resources it requires and then to decide what devices are able to run it. At the most Rouse examines the *output* against the display capabilities or feature list of the receiving device so that it does not for example send an image to a device that cannot display images.

The present invention discloses a method for provisioning the downloading of the applications themselves to the limited resource device, to be executed by the limited-resource device itself. The present invention also examines which limited-resource devices are able to run which user applications. It is therefore believed that claim 1 as amended is both novel and inventive over Rouse.

Regarding independent Claim 20:

- a) Both Rouse and the present invention provide a service to limited resource devices.
- b) Rouse does not mention a content provider (116 on fig.1) but a mobile service provider. The present invention discloses both a content provider and a service provider.
- c) The service provider mentioned by Rouse does not examine the user application to determine if it is able to run on specific limited resource devices, as does the present invention , as explained above with reference to

claim 1, especially since Rouse does not teach the downloading of the application to the limited resource device, but only downloading of the results. That is to say Rouse does not teach provisioning of the application to the device. The present embodiments teach the provisioning of a general application in such a way that it is downloaded specifically to those devices that are able to execute it.

In respect of independent Claim 24, the application described by Rouse discloses a method for limited resource devices to run user applications on the platform of the service provider.

In Column 6 lines 15-24, Rouse discloses that "*information* is transmitted to and from the mobile device", whereas the present invention discloses "aggregating a user **application** for **delivery** to a limited resource device".

In Column 7 (lines 12-25) Rouse mentions "application specific mobile settings such as user preferences" like "default form or view to use." Preferred embodiments of the present invention actually adapt and change user applications to enable applying of service provider rules. It does this by "determining at least one rule for controlling the user application." and "Altering at least one function of the user application according to at least one characteristic of the limited resource device". This is different and more complex than mere "user preferences" as disclosed by Rouse.

The Design Filter disclosed by Rouse (column 8 lines 1-18) does not attempt to adapt the user application itself, as does the present invention as claimed in claim 24.

Rouse discloses (in column 5 line 64 to column 6 line 2), a method for customizing data or "style sheets"> However Rouse does not teach

customizing of the user application itself. The present invention adapts the *user applications themselves* to apply service provider rules as explained above.

With reference now to Claim 25, in column 1 lines 17-22, Rouse discloses "a method for enabling users to access...". This is entirely different from what is proposed in the present invention, which discloses "A method for provisioning a user application for **delivery**..." etc. Accessing data or an application that runs on the service provider's platform is very different from downloading an application and running it **ON** the limited resource device itself.

In column 7 lines 12-25, Rouse discloses "User application preferences 216 may manage user specific settings for a particular application". The present invention, on the other hand, discloses adapting the user application, or at least one characteristic of the user application) to *make it compatible* with the limited resource device. This is different from management of settings, which imply merely user preferences.

In column 8 lines 1-18, Rouse discloses "The design filter 314 validates the application before the application may be **used** by a limited resource device" The present invention, on the other hand, examines and tests the application, adapts it and publishes the user applications in such a way that a limited resource device is only able to see those user applications that are suitable to **run on** that limited resource device.

In column 9 lines 3-25, Rouse discloses a method where the user can "customize the type of information, format of the information." etc. The present embodiments do not *customize the information, format etc.* Rather, as claimed *inter alia* in claim 24 it adapts the actual user application to apply service manager rules

Claims 2 -19 all depend from Claim 1, and are therefore submitted to be allowable with that claim.

Claims 21 -23 all depend from Claim 20, and are therefore submitted to be allowable with that claim.

All of the issues raised by the Examiner have now been dealt with. In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are allowable over the cited reference. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



D'vorah Graeser
Registration No. 40,000

Date: December 2, 2004